REVISED March 8, 2006

2005-2006 No Child Left Behind - Blue Ribbon Schools Program

U.S. Department of Education

Cover Sheet Type of School: (Check all that apply) X Elementary __ Middle __ High __ K-12 __Charter

Name of Principal Mrs. Mary Betry Bass
(Specify: Ms., Miss, Mrs., Dr., Mr., Other) (As it should appear in the official records)

Official School Name Chester Nelson Elementary School
(As it should appear in the official records)

School Mailing Address 1336 W. Spruce Avenue
(If address is P.O. Box, also include street address)

Pinedale CA 93650-1037
City State Zip Code+4 (9 digits total)

County Fresno State School Code Number* 10-62117-60005888

Telephone (559) 327-7600 Fax (559) 327-7690

Website/URL http://qp.clovisusd.k12.ca.us/nelsonelementary E-mail marybass@cusd.com

I have reviewed the information in this application, including the eligibility requirements on page 2, and certify that to the best of my knowledge all information is accurate.

Date January 23, 2006
(Principal's Signature)

Name of Superintendent* Dr. Terry Bradley
(Specify: Ms., Miss, Mrs., Dr., Mr., Other)

District Name Clovis Unified School District Tel. (559) 327-9000

I have reviewed the information in this application, including the eligibility requirements on page 2, and certify that to the best of my knowledge it is accurate.

Date January 24, 2006
(Superintendent's Signature)

Name of School Board
President/Chairperson Mrs. Ginny L. Hovsepian
(Specify: Ms., Miss, Mrs., Dr., Mr., Other)

I have reviewed the information in this package, including the eligibility requirements on page 2, and certify that to the best of my knowledge it is accurate.

Date January 24, 2006
(School Board President's/Chairperson's Signature)

**Private Schools: If the information requested is not applicable, write N/A in the space.*

PART I - ELIGIBILITY CERTIFICATION

[Include this page in the school's application as page 2.]

The signatures on the first page of this application certify that each of the statements below concerning the school's eligibility and compliance with U.S. Department of Education, Office for Civil Rights (OCR) requirements is true and correct.

1. The school has some configuration that includes grades K-12. (Schools with one principal, even K-12 schools, must apply as an entire school.)

2. The school has not been in school improvement status or been identified by the state as "persistently dangerous" within the last two years. To meet final eligibility, the school must meet the state's adequate yearly progress requirement in the 2005-2006 school year.

3. If the school includes grades 7 or higher, it has foreign language as a part of its core curriculum.

4. The school has been in existence for five full years, that is, from at least September 2000 and has not received the 2003, 2004, or 2005 *No Child Left Behind – Blue Ribbon Schools Award.*

5. The nominated school or district is not refusing the OCR access to information necessary to investigate a civil rights complaint or to conduct a district-wide compliance review.

6. The OCR has not issued a violation letter of findings to the school district concluding that the nominated school or the district as a whole has violated one or more of the civil rights statutes. A violation letter of findings will not be considered outstanding if the OCR has accepted a corrective action plan from the district to remedy the violation.

7. The U.S. Department of Justice does not have a pending suit alleging that the nominated school, or the school district as a whole, has violated one or more of the civil rights statutes or the Constitution's equal protection clause.

8. There are no findings of violations of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act in a U.S. Department of Education monitoring report that apply to the school or school district in question; or if there are such findings, the state or district has corrected, or agreed to correct, the findings.

PART II - DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

All data are the most recent year available.

DISTRICT (Questions 1-2 not applicable to private schools)

1. Number of schools in the district:

30	Elementary schools
	Middle schools
4	Junior high schools
5	High schools
3	Other*
42	TOTAL

Other:
- 1Grades 4-8 Community Day School
- 1 Grades 9-12 Community Day School
- 1 Charter High School (CART) Joint Power Agreement between Clovis Unified & Fresno Unified School

2. District Per Pupil Expenditure: $6,457

   Average State Per Pupil Expenditure: $6,983

SCHOOL (To be completed by all schools)

3. Category that best describes the area where the school is located:

[ ] Urban or large central city
[ ] Suburban school with characteristics typical of an urban area
[X] Suburban
[ ] Small city or town in a rural area
[ ] Rural

4. 2 Number of years the principal has been in her/his position at this school.

   1 If fewer than three years, how long was the previous principal at this school?

5. Number of students as of October 1 enrolled at each grade level or its equivalent in applying school only:

Grade	# of Males	# of Females	Grade Total		Grade	# of Males	# of Females	Grade Total
PreK	12	11	23		**7**			
K	40	34	74		**8**			
1	35	44	79		**9**			
2	31	31	62		**10**			
3	47	31	78		**11**			
4	42	36	78		**12**			
5	51	51	102		**Other**			
6	58	38	96			Total With PreK		592
		TOTAL STUDENTS IN THE APPLYING SCHOOL →						**569**

[Throughout the document, round numbers to avoid decimals.]

6. Racial/ethnic composition of the students in the school:

39 % White
4 % Black or African American
38 % Hispanic or Latino
17 % Asian/Pacific Islander
2 % American Indian/Alaskan Native
100% Total

Use only the five standard categories in reporting the racial/ethnic composition of the school.

7. Student turnover, or mobility rate, during the past year: 24 %

[This rate should be calculated using the grid below. The answer to (6) is the mobility rate.]

(1)	Number of students who transferred ***to*** the school after October 1 until the end of the year.	72
(2)	Number of students who transferred ***from*** the school after October 1 until the end of the year.	65
(3)	Total of all transferred students [sum of rows (1) and (2)]	137
(4)	Total number of students in the school as of October 1	569
(5)	Total transferred students in row (3) divided by total students in row (4)	.2407
(6)	Amount in row (5) multiplied by 100	24.07

8. Limited English Proficient students in the school: 18 %

103 Total Number Limited English Proficient

Number of languages represented: 11

Specify languages: Armenian, Farsi, Greek, Hmong, Korean, Telugu, Punjabi, Russian, Spanish, Urdu, and Vietnamese

9. Students eligible for free/reduced-priced meals: 53 %

Total number students who qualify: 299

If this method does not produce an accurate estimate of the percentage of students from low-income families or the school does not participate in the federally-supported lunch program, specify a more accurate estimate, tell why the school chose it, and explain how it arrived at this estimate.

10. Students receiving special education services: 11 %
60 Total Number of Students Served

Indicate below the number of students with disabilities according to conditions designated in the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. Do not add additional categories.

1 Autism	Orthopedic Impairment
Deafness	7 Other Health Impaired
Deaf-Blindness	13 Specific Learning Disability
Emotional Disturbance	33 Speech or Language Impairment
1 Hearing Impairment	Traumatic Brain Injury
3 Mental Retardation	Visual Impairment Including Blindness
Multiple Disabilities	

11. Indicate number of full-time and part-time staff members in each of the categories below:

	Number of Staff	
	Full-time	**Part-Time**
Administrator(s)	1	
Classroom teachers	25	2
Special resource teachers/specialists	4	1
Paraprofessionals	1	6
Support staff	6	
Total number	37	9

12. Average school student-"classroom teacher" ratio, that is, the number of students in the school divided by the FTE of classroom teachers: 18:1

13. Show the attendance patterns of teachers and students as a percentage. The student dropout rate is defined by the state. The student drop-off rate is the difference between the number of entering students and the number of exiting students from the same cohort. (From the same cohort, subtract the number of exiting students from the number of entering students; divide that number by the number of entering students; multiply by 100 to get the percentage drop-off rate.) Briefly explain in 100 words or fewer any major discrepancy between the dropout rate and the drop-off rate. Only middle and high schools need to supply dropout rates and only high schools need to supply drop-off rates.

	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001
Daily student attendance	96%	95%	96%	96%	96%
Daily teacher attendance	96%	97%	93%	97%	96%
Teacher turnover rate	4%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Student dropout rate (middle/high)	%	%	%	%	%
Student drop-off rate (high school)	%	%	%	%	%

PART III – SUMMARY

Welcome to Nelson Elementary, home of the Roadrunners – BEEP! BEEP! In recent years, Nelson has been awarded State Distinguished School in 1998 and 2004, the Bonner Center for Character

Education Award in 2000, 2002, and 2004, and the Clovis Exemplary School Award in 2003 and 2004. Nelson enjoys a long tradition of providing its community with a learning environment committed to excellence. Impressive growth in student achievement over the last three years give testament to Nelson's reputation for substantial student and school achievement, strong community support, as well as for retaining its professional, cohesive staff.

The shared mission of Nelson Elementary is "to provide exemplary programs and services that align all resources to assure that each student achieves at her or his highest level academically and socially." The mission statement serves as the guiding force for school-wide goals and priorities. Our ultimate goal is to prepare individuals to become contributing members of society who value diversity of ideas and cultures and possess an enduring quest to learn. Nelson serves a unique and diverse population. Our busy and colorful playground of enthusiastic children is indicative of the mosaic quality of our school.

A core value of Clovis Unified is educating the whole child "in mind, body, and spirit." Known as the Sparthenian concept, emphasis is placed on academic, physical, and character development. At Nelson, a comprehensive awards program recognizes student performance not only in academics, but also in athletics, and character. Our comprehensive co-curricular programs, including vocal/instrumental music, extensive athletics, and academic enrichment activities, support the academic program. Accordingly, we have established clear grade-level achievement goals for all students to meet proficient and advanced levels of academic performance. Each student will: 1) Read and comprehend a variety of materials, locate, and apply information; 2)Write, speak, listen, and use technology to communicate; 3) Apply mathematical skills to analyze and solve problems; 4) Think creatively and analyze tasks to solve problems; and 5) Develop and demonstrate personal responsibility for learning and self-management.

Teachers differentiate instruction, regrouping within the grade level, to better personalize the learning experience. A protected, daily, 3-hour literacy block enables teachers to deeply align the written, taught, and tested curriculum into powerful units of study engaging students in rigorous material. Student achievement is assessed frequently in reading, language arts, writing, math, and science through a robust formative assessment system utilizing technology to produce immediate reports and disaggregated information. Teachers use results of frequent assessment to reteach and accelerate skill development.

Pro-active leadership, data-driven decision-making, and an emphasis on continuous improvement, empower us to accomplish our mission and achieve our goals. Leadership supports and promotes innovation in the school program. Grade levels meet weekly to share student work samples, analyze academic progress, and discuss effective instructional strategies. Ongoing professional development ensures that the Nelson staff keeps abreast of new learning strategies, innovative teaching techniques, and applied technology in the field of education. Such focus on professional development ensures that Nelson students have equal access to the core curriculum and appropriate instruction matched to their individual learning levels.

Nelson embraces the old African saying, "It takes a village to raise a child." Parental support is a critical component to the success of any school. Nelson enjoys the benefits of an extremely supportive parent community and provides a variety of options for parent involvement. Equally, neighboring businesses and the local university serve as partners in promoting student success. By providing a quality, comprehensive educational program to a diverse population through exemplary curricular programs, co-curricular activities, and comprehensive services, we achieve our mission.

A famous Nelson slogan says it best: "BEEP! BEEP! The B is for the best school anywhere, the E is for extraordinary, the other E is for exemplary and the P is for perseverance, because nothing ever keeps us down. We always say it twice. Why? Just in case you didn't hear it the first time! GO NELSON! BEEP! BEEP!"

PART IV – INDICATORS OF ACADEMIC SUCCESS

1. Assessment Results

Nelson participates in California's Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) program. The California Standards Tests (CST) in English-Language Arts, Mathematics, Science, and History-Social Science are administered to all students in Grades 2-6. Except for a writing component that is administered as part of the Grade 4 English-Language Arts test, all questions are multiple choice. CST scores are reported as one of five performance levels: advanced, proficient, basic, below basic, and far below basic. Performance levels of advanced and proficient are indicated as "at or above proficient" on the Data Display Tables in Part VII-Assessment Results. The scores are used for calculating Nelson's Academic Performance Index (API). Only the results of the California English-Language Arts and Mathematics Standards Tests are used to determine the progress elementary schools are making toward meeting the federal *No Child Left Behind* adequate yearly progress (AYP) requirement that all students score at proficient or above (advanced) on these tests. The following website provides additional information regarding California's Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) program: http://star.cde.ca.gov/star2005/AboutSTAR.asp.

Nelson Assessment Results:

English-Language Arts. A three-year comparison shows growth at all grade levels in the percentage of students scoring in the proficient and advanced performance bands. The overall summary of student achievement over the past three years shows an increase of 8% scoring at or above proficient, from 51% in May 2003 to 59% in May 2005. Most notable is the growth made in Grades 5 (+12%) and 6 (+18%). Students classified as Economically Disadvantaged showed the greatest improvement (+18%) in the three year period growing from 32% to 46% proficient or advanced. Again, Grade 6 demonstrated impressive growth (+24%) increasing from 18% at or above proficient to 42%. Even with the encouraging growth of our economically disadvantaged students, a significant disparity remains between that subgroup and their non-economically disadvantaged counterparts. However, grade level data indicates that the performance gap between the two subgroups is narrowing. English Learners (EL) show slight growth (+4%) from 22% to 26%, over the three year period. In addition to CST, our ELs are assessed annually using the California English Language Development Test (CELDT). Using results from CELDT, Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (AMAO) establish growth targets for English Learners in relation to English development (AMAO I) and English proficiency (AMAO II). In 2005, 59% of ELs attained AMAO I and 46% attained AMAO II, exceeding the state-expected growth targets of 51% and 30.7%, respectively. All ethnic subgroups demonstrated growth over the past three years. Overall, Grade 6 reflects the greatest growth. Whereas, our Asian students made the most growth (+20%) compared to Hispanic (+6%) and White (+5%) students, the Asian subgroup continues to lag behind Hispanics and Whites in the overall percentage of students performing in the proficient or advanced ranges. Students with Disabilities dropped slightly (-2%) during the past three years, from 35% to 33% at or above proficient. Their non-disabled counterparts improved from 56% to 72% (+16%). All of Nelson's significant subgroups exceeded AYP goals in English-Language Arts.

Mathematics. An overview of student achievement during the past three years shows an increase of 8%, from 55% to 64% of students performing in the proficient or advanced performance bands. Although Grade 2 dropped 1% during this time span, every other grade level boasted substantial growth, specifically in Grades 5 and 6, growing 15% and 16%, respectively. Notable is the 10% increase in students scoring in the advanced performance band. Economically-disadvantaged students displayed improvement at all grade levels, although this subgroup continues to lag behind their non-economically disadvantaged counterparts. ELs, although logging improvement over three years (+10%), show inconsistent growth from year to year. Overall, all ethnic subgroups have grown during the past three years: 76% white, 52% Hispanic, and 55% Asian subgroups scored at or above proficient levels. Although a trend of growth is evident, both Hispanic and Asian subgroups dropped in performance from May 2004 to May 2005. Analysis of subskills suggests that number sense is an area of deficit, particularly related to its affect when performing more complex mathematics. This also may be further complicated by the impact of understanding and reading English. Efforts to deeply align math curriculum and articulate instruction between grade levels continue. Students with Disabilities grew 1%, from 35% to 36% at or above proficient during the last three years. Non-disabled counterparts grew 7% overall with

an increase of 10% of students performing at the advanced level. By the time this subgroup exits Nelson in Grade 6, their growth is significant. Marked growth is evident in both the proficient and advanced performance bands, from 43% to 62% in the proficient level (+19%) and 24% increase, from 1% to 25% in the advanced level. All Nelson subgroups exceeded AYP goals in Mathematics.

2. Using Assessment Results

Nelson maintains a comprehensive assessment program designed to motivate students and provide a clear picture of the school's overall success. An integral part of teaching, the assessment program is designed to provide staff with data to modify instruction in meeting individual student needs, recognize student and teacher achievement, and assess the school's overall success. Student assessments are administered in a variety of ways and with an array of instruments all aligned with state standards.

California's Student Testing and Reporting (STAR) system enables teachers, students, families, and administrators to compare student progress quantitatively with the ultimate goal of moving students to the proficient and advanced quintiles. Together with CUSD, Nelson has institutionalized a robust formative assessment system using curriculum-based, performance-based, and criterion-referenced assessments. District-wide "essential" standards, aligned with state standards, were developed to ensure continuity at each site and between and among grade levels. Standards-based assessments in the form of Math Benchmarks and quarterly Language Arts Formative Tests (LAFT) are deeply aligned to these essential standards and assists teachers in monitoring student growth and adjusting instruction as needed. Item analysis and relative rank generated from the testing data are used as a tool to identify students in need of academic interventions and accelerations. Edusoft, a web-based assessment platform, generates multiple-measure reports enabling teachers to disaggregate and frequently monitor student progress.

Such "dollops" of feedback provide crucial information for adjusting instruction and re-teaching specific skills as well as accelerate student learning when appropriate. Individual student plans, called Teacher Grade Level Estimates (TGLEs), are written for all students and contain a diagnosis of the child's sub-skill weaknesses, strengths, and a prescriptive plan to assist the child in reaching grade level competencies and moving to the next CST quintile. In the fall, teachers conference with parents to review the TGLE plan. At the mid-year point these TGLEs are reviewed and modified, as needed, to insure adequate progress.

Nelson's overall school performance is measured through Clovis Assessment System for Sustained Improvement (CLASSI), a district-wide, comprehensive approach to assessing educational quality. CLASSI monitors annually critical student achievement indicators for grades K through 6 and establishes standards and ratings for evaluating certain school management, community involvement, and co-curricular priorities which are indicative of comprehensive, well-managed school programs.

3. Communicating Assessment Results

Every August, a STAR report is mailed to parents with a letter explaining the meaning and value of the CST as it pertains to their child's achievement. Teachers meet with the principal to discuss needed strategies through the TGLE progress. Parent-teacher conferences establish the parent's role in assisting their child and the student's role in reaching goals. In addition, disaggregated results are communicated through in-depth presentations with Nelson's multiple parent forums, such as the School Assessment Review Team (SART), Intercultural-Diversity Advisory Council (IDAC), English Learner Advisory Committee (ELAC), and School Site Council (SSC).

Student on-going progress and achievement is communicated to Nelson parents through informal home communication, mid-quarter progress reports, parent/teacher conferences, quarterly report cards, and in weekly and monthly newsletters written by classroom teachers. In addition, faculty has developed quarterly grade level report cards that reflect student progress towards mastering the standards. This card also addresses social, emotional, and physical development along with academic achievement. Two BCLAD teachers and Spanish and Hmong Bilingual Instructional Assistants provide translation when needed.

Specific reports, such as Academic Performance Index (API) school performance scores and Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) are released by the California Department of Education and reported on its website. These reports are published in the local newspaper, as well as "CUSD Today," the district-

published monthly newspaper.

4. Sharing Success

Nelson enjoys a broad-based, collaborative relationship with other schools. At the district level, Job-Alike sessions enable principals to dialog regarding educational issues and share best practices associated with high achieving schools, such as Nelson. Our internal reading intervention program in Grades 1, 4, and 6 has been spotlighted at one such session. Local schools have visited Nelson classrooms observing teachers utilizing Steve Dunn's Project LEAD reading and writing strategies. In fact, the success from implementing Project LEAD combined with Nelson's school-wide commitment to a daily, uninterrupted three-hour literacy block, and the articulated writing curriculum, generated area interest in developing an articulated writing curriculum and assessment system, K-6. As a result, the Clovis West Area Writing Cadre emerged and developed an articulated writing blueprint for all grade levels, addressing narrative, summary, persuasive, and response to literature writing genres. Nelson staff has been key drivers in this endeavor. Four Nelson teachers are designated as Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment (BTSA) Support Providers, assigned to novice teachers as mentors and models of teaching excellence. Frequently, these teachers are invited to conduct demonstration lessons and present at workshops. In addition, our Resource Teacher is a known leader in curriculum development and often called upon to share her expertise. For example, she organized the Science standards by topic and aligned these topics to resources in grade level instructional units. This now serves as the model curriculum guide in the district. Additionally, she is collaborating with district level personnel in creating Science formative assessments, K-6. Recently, we began a partnership with Chafee Zoo to develop science units utilizing the marvelous resources our local zoo has to offer. The initial goal is to create an outdoor "laboratory" experience for all third graders in the San Joaquin Valley. Nelson's success is also shared through school, district, and local publications.

PART V-CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

1. Curriculum

Nelson challenges all students with a powerful core curriculum. This curriculum is designed to provide an academic foundation for the future linking the transition from pre-school to kindergarten and elementary to intermediate school. The curriculum content at Nelson is aligned with district learning standards and continually reviewed by teachers, parents, and district curriculum advisors to meet adjusted state frameworks and national norms. Reports including, *A Call To Action*, *Guide to the California Reading Initiative*, *No Child Left Behind*, *It's Elementary*, *Every Student Can Read, Every Student Will Read,* and *Mathematics Task Force Report* have guided district frameworks which in turn provide Nelson with benchmarks and standards for each grade level. The standards and benchmarks cover English-Language Arts, Mathematics, Science, History-Social Science, Physical Education, Health-Wellness, Technology, and Visual and Performing Arts.

English-Language Arts-

- Nelson uses State adopted Houghton-Mifflin Language Arts Program in grades K-6. Regularly scheduled grade level meetings and cross-grade level meetings are an important element in coordinating the curriculum to instruction.
- Accelerated Reader Program and Monitoring STAR system
- Kate Kinsella Reading Strategies in 4th, 5th and 6th
- Differentiated Curriculum in grades K-6
- Scientifically Based Project Lead strategies K-6
- Quarterly Language Arts Formative Testing

Mathematics-

- Computational and problem-solving skills are an integral part of mathematical instruction at Nelson Elementary. The understanding of basic concepts is taught on a progressive K through 6 continuum. Daily practice and school-wide recognition are provided for mastery of basic facts (i.e. addition, subtraction, multiplication, division and mixed).

- Nelson uses a broad-based math curriculum including, but not limited to, all the mathematical strands that consist of number theory, measurement, geometry, patterns and functions, statistics and probability, logic, and algebra. These strands are deeply aligned to CUSD's Math Benchmarks Tests.
- Manipulatives, hands-on materials, replacement units, computers, mental math activities, and calculators are used on a school-wide basis.
- Mathematics is integrated with other curricula.
- Flexible grouping for instruction
- State Adopted Scott Foresman Curriculum
- Quarterly Curriculum-Based Site Tests to measure student growth and achievement.
- Accelerated Math in upper grades
- District Math Benchmark Tests

In other core curriculum areas, the emphasis is placed on experiential, hands-on, and critical thinking skills. Students access Science and Social Science curriculum through materials such as State adopted texts, Project AIMS, labs, literature, guest speakers, biographies, assemblies, technology, and field trips. Sixth grade students learn first hand about science at the Regional Learning Center (RLC) in Sonora during a three-day field trip that includes nature hikes, star gazing, raptor exhibit, and a survival unit. Living history days at Grades 4-6 as well as curriculum-based culminating field trips have allowed students to experience historical concepts in real life situations. P.E. basic skills are taught throughout the year and fitness is formally assessed each spring. Students have the opportunity to be involved in instrumental music, chorus, oral interpretation, and drama. A highlight of the fine arts curriculum many of our teachers are trained in Disciplined Based Art Education, encompassing art production, history, criticism, and aesthetics. Classrooms attend regular training sessions in the Library Media Center for instruction and project oriented technology. Students work during and beyond school hours on the Internet, CD-ROM, and the PowerPoint program with the assistance of library and teaching staff, as well as parent volunteers.

2a. Reading Curriculum

"What's the most important thing we do at Nelson?" Ask any student or staff member on the Nelson campus and the resounding response is: "Learn to Read!" Nelson is dedicated to providing students with a strong foundation which promotes a lifetime of learning by learning to read and reading to learn. The Houghton Mifflin reading series is taught K-6. The anthologies are augmented by core literature and specific non-fiction materials, enabling teachers to delve purposefully and ensure deep alignment of standards. Equally, Science and Social Science are integrated into the language arts instruction allowing for greater exposure to their content while reinforcing specific reading strategies.

All Nelson teachers have been trained in Steve Dunn's *Project LEAD* Reading and Writing workshops providing extensive strategies for a balanced literacy program. Students study various genres of literature and learn to make connections between reading and writing to develop a comprehensive understanding of Language Arts. The following strategies are currently being implemented at Nelson: Think Alouds, Shared Reading, Guided Reading, whole group and small group instruction for at risk children and Literature Circles for students reading at or above grade level.

Because of our diverse population, teachers explored methods for differentiating reading instruction so that students would be purposefully engaged in skill-enhancing and grade appropriate materials. Therefore, an internal reading intervention program was instituted this year in Grades 1, 4, and 6. All students within these grade levels are ability-grouped for 60-90 minutes of the daily literacy block, which is three hours of uninterrupted language arts instruction. Struggling readers receive intensive, small group instruction, while those at and above grade level are challenged with rigorous material so that they can accelerate their reading achievement. The Resource Teacher, Special Education teachers, and even the principal work in concert with a classroom teacher, instructing the neediest students. Reading growth is assessed frequently using multiple measurements, including running records, Dynamic Indicators of Basic Literacy Development (DIBELS), Accelerated Reader STAR test, and curriculum-based comprehension tests. Students are regrouped appropriately. A critical component of our internal reading intervention program is the commitment of the teachers to collaborate and dialog weekly regarding

student progress and targeted instructional practices. Early results indicate that the Nelson internal reading intervention program significantly improves reading performance of ALL students, not solely those reading below grade level.

Additionally, Accelerated Reader (AR) is a school-wide reading enrichment program which, through the visionary oversight of Nelson's Library Media Technician, has embellished Nelson's reading program. Students read books at their appropriate instructional level and then take a comprehension test. A highly engaging incentive program reinforces students' progress as they earn points for each book they read. On any given day one can find intrinsically motivated Nelson students reading before school, while walking in line to the cafeteria and after school. AR has opened a whole new world of reading by motivating and challenging Nelson students at every reading level. Even our Special Education students eagerly read to attain the prestigious Reading Medallion.

3. Other Curriculum: Mathematics

Strengths of Nelson's mathematics program include use of manipulatives, real-world lessons, math journals, problems of the week, and problem solving strategies. Teachers integrate mathematics through the core curriculum by computing data and interpreting graphs and charts in other curricular areas. Participation in CUSD's Math Connections Workshops, has provided teachers with the opportunity to collaborate and develop innovative math units aligned with state standards and *California Mathematics*, the state adopted Scott Foresman text. A variety of instructional program/materials are used including Project Aims, Touch Math, *ADD Math*, *Math Steps*, Accelerated Math, and replacement units. A new focus has been towards math facts mastery through Mrs. Bass' Math Club where students are encouraged to learn math families and are tested weekly to monitor mastery. The program has been very effective in attaining mastery of basic math skills. This in turn assists with development and mastery of higher level mathematics standards. In addition, students in Grade 6 participate in Math Switch, a program in which they are ability-grouped for instruction.

4. Instructional Methods

Nelson's goal is to maximize the educational opportunity and achievement of all students by practicing exemplary instructional strategies and developing powerful learning experiences in all subject areas. Core curriculum areas of English-Language Arts, Mathematics, Science, Social Science, Technology, P.E., and Visual and Performing Arts reflect *CUSD's Grade Level Standards* as they align with the State Frameworks and Standards. Integration of these content areas allows teachers to use a comprehensive approach as they focus on development and improvement of language arts and math skills. A wide variety of techniques, methods, and strategies, such as "think alouds", hands-on activities, collaborative projects, and flexible grouping give teachers the means to meet student needs. Teachers also strike a healthy balance between independent, teacher-directed, and group projects. By differentiating instruction, teachers are able to tailor the child's education to his or her instructional level. Whether the child is below grade level or at the top of the class, at Nelson, we hold true to *No Child Left Behind*!

Nelson believes teacher knowledge drives decision-making for productive learning environments and increased student achievement. Nelson teachers take the responsibility in designing instructional experiences to meet all learners' needs. Teachers use a backward design approach to create rigorous, powerful units of study. This enables them to first identify the standard, and then construct a lesson focused on student mastery. Teacher's questioning strategies utilize Bloom's Taxonomy, teach to a variety of modalities, and employ open-ended techniques that integrate critical thinking skills. Furthermore, they use flexible scheduling, team teaching, and grouping strategies to meet the needs of all students. The result is students are purposefully engaged in rigorous coursework and continuously making and deepening connections based on these instructional experiences. Demonstration of student knowledge occurs and is monitored for growth through a wide variety of programs including: Accelerated Reader, Math Masters, Mrs. Bass's Math Club, Science Club, After School Intervention, Migrant Program, Computer Lab, Multi-Cultural activities, Learning Centers, Leveled Reading Groups, History Day and Science Fair projects, Destination Imagination, Oral Interpretation, Reports, Poster Making, Essays, and Audio/Video Presentations. Through ongoing diagnosis and observation of student learning behaviors,

teachers are empowered to make informed decisions about instruction.

5. Professional Development

Nelson teachers exhibit a strong sense of professionalism and camaraderie, which has been cultivated through shared decision-making focused on attaining school goals. Teachers assume various leadership roles to increase knowledge and share expertise with others.

Professional development focuses on both individual and school wide goals. It is driven by teacher input from the *School Based Coordinated Program (SBCP) Needs Assessment* which is given in the spring. Through this needs assessment, staff list future professional needs and desires. Programs are planned and evaluated in the spring through strategic planning meetings with input from teachers, administration, support staff, and parents. Opportunities to dialogue, plan, prepare, and reflect are provided weekly through either faculty meetings, grade level meetings, and/or quality team meetings. Resources are budgeted for teachers to attend a variety of professional development activities. However, Nelson teacher-led staff development presentations have been the most beneficial and cost-effective in providing opportunities for our staff to grow professionally as well as share expertise.

High-quality teaching is the most dominant factor in student success. To ensure that our teachers maintain instructional expertise, they attend conferences, workshops, in-services, and staff development. Ongoing professional development ensures that Nelson staff keep abreast of new learning strategies, innovative teaching techniques, and applied technology in the field of education. Such focus on professional development ensures that Nelson students have equal access to the core curriculum and appropriate instruction matched to their individual learning levels.

PART VII – ASSESSMENT RESULTS

ENGLISH-LANGUAGE ARTS

DATA DISPLAY TABLE

ENGLISH/LANGUAGE ARTS SCHOOL SUMMARY CALIFORNIA STANDARDS TEST

	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003
Testing Month	**May**	**May**	**May**
SCHOOL SCORES			
% At or Above Proficient	59	57	51
% Advanced	24	24	20
% Below Proficient	41	43	49
Number of students tested	449	442	451
Percent of total students tested	99	100	99
Number of students alternatively assessed	1	0	1
Percent of students alternatively assessed	1	0	1
SUBGROUP SCORES			
Economically Disadvantaged			
% At or Above Proficient	46	48	32
% Advanced	12	8	8
% Below Proficient	54	52	68
Number of students tested	243	229	238
White			
% At or Above Proficient	74	74	69
% Advanced	41	37	32
% Below Proficient	26	26	31
Number of students tested	191	209	215
Asian			
% At or Above Proficient	41	41	21
% Advanced	4	12	4
% Below Proficient	59	59	79
Number of students tested	52	59	71
Hispanic			
% At or Above Proficient	48	40	42
% Advanced	11	10	11
% Below Proficient	52	60	58
Number of students tested	163	135	127
Students with Disability			
% At or Above Proficient	33	32	35
% Advanced	8	7	14
% Below Proficient	67	68	65
Number of students tested	51	61	94
Students with No Reported Disability			
% At or Above Proficient	72	62	56
% Advanced	26	27	22
% Below Proficient	28	38	44
Number of students tested	398	381	357

DATA DISPLAY TABLE

ENGLISH/LANGUAGE ARTS GRADE 2 CALIFORNIA STANDARDS TEST

	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003
Testing Month	**May**	**May**	**May**
SCHOOL SCORES			
% At or Above Proficient	66	61	67
% Advanced	31	28	28
% Below Proficient	34	39	33
Number of students tested	81	79	97
Percent of total students tested	100	100	99
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	1
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	1
SUBGROUP SCORES			
Economically Disadvantaged			
% At or Above Proficient	53	47	50
% Advanced	21	13	17
% Below Proficient	37	53	49
Number of students tested	47	47	46
Non-Economically Disadvantaged			
% At or Above Proficient	82	81	82
% Advanced	NA	NA	NA
% Below Proficient	18	19	18
Number of students tested	34	32	51
English Learner			
% At or Above Proficient	46	40	39
% Advanced	NA	NA	NA
% Below Proficient	54	60	61
Number of students tested	13	20	23
Fluent English Proficient & English Only			
% At or Above Proficient	69	68	76
% Advanced	34	NA	NA
% Below Proficient	31	32	24
Number of students tested	68	59	74
White			
% At or Above Proficient	79	81	80
% Advanced	52	50	37
% Below Proficient	21	19	20
Number of students tested	33	31	46
Asian			
% At or Above Proficient	NA	46	25
% Advanced	NA	NA	NA
% Below Proficient	NA	54	75
Number of students tested	NA	13	16
Hispanic			
% At or Above Proficient	57	43	67
% Advanced	17	3	23
% Below Proficient	43	57	34
Number of students tested	35	30	30
Students with Disability			
% At or Above Proficient	NA	NA	NA
% Advanced	NA	NA	NA
% Below Proficient	NA	NA	NA
Number of students tested	NA	NA	NA
Students with No Reported Disability			
% At or Above Proficient	65	63	73
% Advanced	31	31	31
% Below Proficient	34	37	27
Number of students tested	77	68	88

DATA DISPLAY TABLE

ENGLISH/LANGUAGE ARTS GRADE 3 CALIFORNIA STANDARDS TEST

	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003
Testing Month	**May**	**May**	**May**
SCHOOL SCORES			
% At or Above Proficient	52	63	51
% Advanced	11	23	21
% Below Proficient	47	37	49
Number of students tested	81	97	81
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES			
Economically Disadvantaged			
% At or Above Proficient	42	45	35
% Advanced	4	12	8
% Below Proficient	58	55	65
Number of students tested	50	41	41
Non-Economically Disadvantaged			
% At or Above Proficient	68	75	68
% Advanced	NA	NA	NA
% Below Proficient	32	25	32
Number of students tested	31	56	40
English Learner			
% At or Above Proficient	18	39	29
% Advanced	NA	NA	NA
% Below Proficient	82	61	71
Number of students tested	17	19	21
Fluent English Proficient & English Only			
% At or Above Proficient	61	68	59
% Advanced	15	26	NA
% Below Proficient	49	32	41
Number of students tested	64	78	60
White			
% At or Above Proficient	70	79	74
% Advanced	27	30	37
% Below Proficient	30	21	26
Number of students tested	30	47	38
Asian			
% At or Above Proficient	33	57	20
% Advanced	NA	NA	NA
% Below Proficient	67	43	80
Number of students tested	12	14	20
Hispanic			
% At or Above Proficient	45	36	45
% Advanced	0	18	10
% Below Proficient	55	64	55
Number of students tested	33	29	21
Students with Disability			
% At or Above Proficient	NA	25	46
% Advanced	NA	8	16
% Below Proficient	NA	75	54
Number of students tested	NA	12	13
Students with No Reported Disability			
% At or Above Proficient	55	68	52
% Advanced	11	25	23
% Below Proficient	45	32	48
Number of students tested	73	85	68

DATA DISPLAY TABLE

ENGLISH/LANGUAGE ARTS GRADE 4 CALIFORNIA STANDARDS TEST

	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003
Testing Month	**May**	**May**	**May**
SCHOOL SCORES			
% At or Above Proficient	64	58	55
% Advanced	30	26	28
% Below Proficient	46	41	45
Number of students tested	104	82	98
Percent of total students tested	99	100	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	1	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	1	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES			
Economically Disadvantaged			
% At or Above Proficient	51	38	38
% Advanced	20	0	17
% Below Proficient	49	62	63
Number of students tested	48	37	48
Non-Economically Disadvantaged			
% At or Above Proficient	76	75	70
% Advanced	NA	NA	NA
% Below Proficient	25	25	30
Number of students tested	56	44	98
English Learner			
% At or Above Proficient	33	22	18
% Advanced	NA	NA	NA
% Below Proficient	67	78	82
Number of students tested	16	18	11
Fluent English Proficient & English Only			
% At or Above Proficient	69	67	59
% Advanced	33	34	NA
% Below Proficient	41	33	41
Number of students tested	88	64	87
White			
% At or Above Proficient	76	73	68
% Advanced	42	40	39
% Below Proficient	24	28	32
Number of students tested	45	40	56
Asian			
% At or Above Proficient	57	35	38
% Advanced	NA	NA	NA
% Below Proficient	43	65	62
Number of students tested	14	17	13
Hispanic			
% At or Above Proficient	56	48	43
% Advanced	21	16	10
% Below Proficient	44	52	57
Number of students tested	35	25	21
Students with Disability			
% At or Above Proficient	33	53	36
% Advanced	7	7	NA
% Below Proficient	67	47	64
Number of students tested	15	15	14
Students with No Reported Disability			
% At or Above Proficient	69	58	57
% Advanced	34	30	17
% Below Proficient	31	42	43
Number of students tested	87	67	83

DATA DISPLAY TABLE

ENGLISH/LANGUAGE ARTS GRADE 5 CALIFORNIA STANDARDS TEST

	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003
Testing Month	**May**	**May**	**May**
SCHOOL SCORES			
% At or Above Proficient	52	53	41
% Advanced	18	26	7
% Below Proficient	48	47	59
Number of students tested	90	100	91
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES			
Economically Disadvantaged			
% At or Above Proficient	33	34	25
% Advanced	2	6	0
% Below Proficient	67	66	75
Number of students tested	52	47	52
Non-Economically Disadvantaged			
% At or Above Proficient	77	70	62
% Advanced	NA	NA	NA
% Below Proficient	23	30	38
Number of students tested	39	53	39
English Learner			
% At or Above Proficient	19	31	18
% Advanced	NA	NA	NA
% Below Proficient	81	69	82
Number of students tested	16	13	22
Fluent English Proficient & English Only			
% At or Above Proficient	59	56	48
% Advanced	23	29	NA
% Below Proficient	41	44	52
Number of students tested	74	87	69
White			
% At or Above Proficient	69	70	46
% Advanced	34	43	11
% Below Proficient	31	30	54
Number of students tested	35	54	37
Asian			
% At or Above Proficient	42	50	42
% Advanced	NA	NA	NA
% Below Proficient	58	50	58
Number of students tested	19	12	19
Hispanic			
% At or Above Proficient	42	32	34
% Advanced	8	4	0
% Below Proficient	58	68	65
Number of students tested	36	25	29
Students with Disability			
% At or Above Proficient	27	12	25
% Advanced	0	6	12
% Below Proficient	73	88	75
Number of students tested	11	17	12
Students with No Reported Disability			
% At or Above Proficient	56	62	43
% Advanced	21	30	5
% Below Proficient	44	38	66
Number of students tested	90	82	79

DATA DISPLAY TABLE

ENGLISH/LANGUAGE ARTS GRADE 6 CALIFORNIA STANDARDS TEST

	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003
Testing Month	**May**	**May**	**May**
SCHOOL SCORES			
% At or Above Proficient	60	54	42
% Advanced	28	18	17
% Below Proficient	40	46	58
Number of students tested	93	87	88
Percent of total students tested	100	100	99
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	1
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	1
SUBGROUP SCORES			
Economically Disadvantaged			
% At or Above Proficient	42	36	18
% Advanced	13	8	2
% Below Proficient	58	64	82
Number of students tested	49	47	50
Non-Economically Disadvantaged			
% At or Above Proficient	80	75	74
% Advanced	NA	NA	NA
% Below Proficient	20	25	26
Number of students tested	44	40	38
English Learner			
% At or Above Proficient	17	0	5
% Advanced	NA	NA	NA
% Below Proficient	83	100	95
Number of students tested	13	14	19
Fluent English Proficient & English Only			
% At or Above Proficient	66	64	52
% Advanced	34	22	NA
% Below Proficient	34	36	48
Number of students tested	80	73	69
White			
% At or Above Proficient	75	68	70
% Advanced	46	24	30
% Below Proficient	25	32	30
Number of students tested	48	38	40
Asian			
% At or Above Proficient	54	44	13
% Advanced	NA	NA	NA
% Below Proficient	46	56	87
Number of students tested	14	16	15
Hispanic			
% At or Above Proficient	43	43	18
% Advanced	9	11	11
% Below Proficient	57	57	82
Number of students tested	23	28	28
Students with Disability			
% At or Above Proficient	23	NA	7
% Advanced	8	NA	7
% Below Proficient	77	NA	93
Number of students tested	13	NA	14
Students with No Reported Disability			
% At or Above Proficient	66	58	46
% Advanced	32	20	19
% Below Proficient	35	42	54
Number of students tested	80	80	78

MATHEMATICS

DATA DISPLAY TABLE

MATHEMATICS SCHOOL SUMMARY CALIFORNIA STANDARDS TEST

	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003
Testing Month	**May**	**May**	**May**
SCHOOL SCORES			
% At or Above Proficient	63	64	55
% Advanced	33	31	23
% Below Proficient	37	36	45
Number of students tested	448	443	452
Percent of total students tested	99	100	99
Number of students alternatively assessed	1	0	1
Percent of students alternatively assessed	1	0	1
SUBGROUP SCORES			
Economically Disadvantaged			
% At or Above Proficient	50	51	41
% Advanced	24	19	13
% Below Proficient	50	49	59
Number of students tested	242	230	239
White			
% At or Above Proficient	76	72	66
% Advanced	43	38	33
% Below Proficient	24	28	34
Number of students tested	191	209	215
Asian			
% At or Above Proficient	55	62	41
% Advanced	23	25	11
% Below Proficient	45	38	59
Number of students tested	52	59	71
Hispanic			
% At or Above Proficient	52	55	44
% Advanced	25	22	17
% Below Proficient	48	45	56
Number of students tested	162	136	128
Students with Disability			
% At or Above Proficient	36	41	35
% Advanced	12	16	12
% Below Proficient	64	59	65
Number of students tested	50	61	94
Students with No Reported Disability			
% At or Above Proficient	67	67	60
% Advanced	36	33	26
% Below Proficient	33	33	40
Number of students tested	398	382	358

DATA DISPLAY TABLE

MATHEMATICS GRADE 2 CALIFORNIA STANDARDS TEST

	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003
Testing Month	**May**	**May**	**May**
SCHOOL SCORES			
% At or Above Proficient	76	77	78
% Advanced	56	48	45
% Below Proficient	24	23	22
Number of students tested	81	79	97
Percent of total students tested	100	100	99
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES			
Economically Disadvantaged			
% At or Above Proficient	62	70	72
% Advanced	49	35	37
% Below Proficient	38	30	28
Number of students tested	47	47	46
Non-Economically Disadvantaged			
% At or Above Proficient	94	88	84
% Advanced	NA	NA	NA
% Below Proficient	6	12	16
Number of students tested	34	32	51
English Learner			
% At or Above Proficient	62	70	61
% Advanced	NA	NA	NA
% Below Proficient	38	30	39
Number of students tested	13	20	23
Fluent English Proficient & English Only			
% At or Above Proficient	78	80	84
% Advanced	58	51	NA
% Below Proficient	22	20	16
Number of students tested	68	59	74
White			
% At or Above Proficient	91	90	85
% Advanced	67	67	54
% Below Proficient	9	10	15
Number of students tested	33	31	46
Asian			
% At or Above Proficient	NA	85	56
% Advanced	NA	NA	NA
% Below Proficient	NA	15	44
Number of students tested	NA	13	16
Hispanic			
% At or Above Proficient	63	60	66
% Advanced	51	24	23
% Below Proficient	37	40	37
Number of students tested	35	30	30
Students with Disability			
% At or Above Proficient	NA	70	46
% Advanced	NA	30	37
% Below Proficient	NA	30	54
Number of students tested	NA	10	13
Students with No Reported Disability			
% At or Above Proficient	74	78	73
% Advanced	56	51	31
% Below Proficient	26	22	27
Number of students tested	77	68	78

DATA DISPLAY TABLE

MATHEMATICS GRADE 3 CALIFORNIA STANDARDS TEST

	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003
Testing Month	**May**	**May**	**May**
SCHOOL SCORES			
% At or Above Proficient	69	73	61
% Advanced	26	43	27
% Below Proficient	31	27	39
Number of students tested	81	97	82
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES			
Economically Disadvantaged			
% At or Above Proficient	59	69	51
% Advanced	20	33	12
% Below Proficient	40	31	49
Number of students tested	49	42	41
Non-Economically Disadvantaged			
% At or Above Proficient	84	75	73
% Advanced	NA	NA	NA
% Below Proficient	16	25	27
Number of students tested	31	56	40
English Learner			
% At or Above Proficient	63	68	57
% Advanced	NA	NA	NA
% Below Proficient	37	32	43
Number of students tested	17	19	21
Fluent English Proficient & English Only			
% At or Above Proficient	70	74	63
% Advanced	27	45	NA
% Below Proficient	30	26	37
Number of students tested	64	78	60
White			
% At or Above Proficient	87	83	74
% Advanced	33	51	39
% Below Proficient	13	17	26
Number of students tested	30	47	38
Asian			
% At or Above Proficient	67	64	50
% Advanced	NA	NA	NA
% Below Proficient	33	36	50
Number of students tested	12	14	20
Hispanic			
% At or Above Proficient	56	66	52
% Advanced	21	41	14
% Below Proficient	44	34	48
Number of students tested	33	29	21
Students with Disability			
% At or Above Proficient	NA	33	46
% Advanced	NA	8	5
% Below Proficient	NA	67	54
Number of students tested	NA	12	13
Students with No Reported Disability			
% At or Above Proficient	68	79	68
% Advanced	26	48	33
% Below Proficient	32	21	32
Number of students tested	73	85	68

DATA DISPLAY TABLE

MATHEMATICS GRADE 4 CALIFORNIA STANDARDS TEST

	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003
Testing Month	**May**	**May**	**May**
SCHOOL SCORES			
% At or Above Proficient	64	71	47
% Advanced	30	34	23
% Below Proficient	46	29	53
Number of students tested	104	82	98
Percent of total students tested	99	100	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	1	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	1	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES			
Economically Disadvantaged			
% At or Above Proficient	49	55	33
% Advanced	28	16	10
% Below Proficient	51	45	67
Number of students tested	48	38	48
Non-Economically Disadvantaged			
% At or Above Proficient	63	84	62
% Advanced	NA	NA	NA
% Below Proficient	37	16	38
Number of students tested	56	44	50
English Learner			
% At or Above Proficient	53	22	27
% Advanced	NA	0	NA
% Below Proficient	47	68	73
Number of students tested	16	18	11
Fluent English Proficient & English Only			
% At or Above Proficient	57	70	51
% Advanced	31	36	NA
% Below Proficient	43	30	49
Number of students tested	88	64	87
White			
% At or Above Proficient	69	70	59
% Advanced	36	40	33
% Below Proficient	31	30	41
Number of students tested	45	40	56
Asian			
% At or Above Proficient	57	71	54
% Advanced	NA	NA	NA
% Below Proficient	43	29	46
Number of students tested	14	17	13
Hispanic			
% At or Above Proficient	47	72	29
% Advanced	27	24	10
% Below Proficient	53	28	71
Number of students tested	35	25	21
Students with Disability			
% At or Above Proficient	20	67	14
% Advanced	7	33	8
% Below Proficient	80	33	86
Number of students tested	15	15	14
Students with No Reported Disability			
% At or Above Proficient	63	72	54
% Advanced	36	34	30
% Below Proficient	37	28	46
Number of students tested	89	67	83

DATA DISPLAY TABLE

MATHEMATICS GRADE 5 CALIFORNIA STANDARDS TEST

	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003
Testing Month	**May**	**May**	**May**
SCHOOL SCORES			
% At or Above Proficient	56	49	41
% Advanced	22	16	1
% Below Proficient	44	51	59
Number of students tested	90	100	91
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES			
Economically Disadvantaged			
% At or Above Proficient	37	30	29
% Advanced	10	2	0
% Below Proficient	63	70	71
Number of students tested	51	47	52
Non-Economically Disadvantaged			
% At or Above Proficient	82	66	56
% Advanced	NA	NA	NA
% Below Proficient	18	34	44
Number of students tested	39	53	39
English Learner			
% At or Above Proficient	25	23	27
% Advanced	NA	NA	NA
% Below Proficient	75	77	73
Number of students tested	16	13	22
Fluent English Proficient & English Only			
% At or Above Proficient	64	53	45
% Advanced	23	18	NA
% Below Proficient	46	47	55
Number of students tested	74	87	69
White			
% At or Above Proficient	71	63	43
% Advanced	34	26	3
% Below Proficient	29	37	57
Number of students tested	35	54	37
Asian			
% At or Above Proficient	53	50	42
% Advanced	NA	NA	NA
% Below Proficient	47	50	58
Number of students tested	19	12	19
Hispanic			
% At or Above Proficient	44	28	38
% Advanced	11	0	0
% Below Proficient	56	72	62
Number of students tested	36	25	29
Students with Disability			
% At or Above Proficient	18	18	25
% Advanced	0	6	0
% Below Proficient	82	83	75
Number of students tested	11	17	12
Students with No Reported Disability			
% At or Above Proficient	62	56	43
% Advanced	25	18	1
% Below Proficient	38	44	57
Number of students tested	79	82	79

DATA DISPLAY TABLE

MATHEMATICS GRADE 6 CALIFORNIA STANDARDS TEST

	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003
Testing Month	**May**	**May**	**May**
SCHOOL SCORES			
% At or Above Proficient	61	50	45
% Advanced	33	16	17
% Below Proficient	39	50	55
Number of students tested	93	87	88
Percent of total students tested	100	100	99
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	1
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	1
SUBGROUP SCORES			
Economically Disadvantaged			
% At or Above Proficient	46	34	22
% Advanced	15	10	6
% Below Proficient	54	66	78
Number of students tested	49	47	50
Non-Economically Disadvantaged			
% At or Above Proficient	77	70	76
% Advanced	NA	NA	NA
% Below Proficient	23	30	24
Number of students tested	44	40	38
English Learner			
% At or Above Proficient	33	14	16
% Advanced	NA	NA	NA
% Below Proficient	67	86	84
Number of students tested	13	14	19
Fluent English Proficient & English Only			
% At or Above Proficient	65	58	54
% Advanced	37	16	NA
% Below Proficient	35	42	46
Number of students tested	80	73	69
White			
% At or Above Proficient	71	55	70
% Advanced	48	13	30
% Below Proficient	30	45	30
Number of students tested	48	38	40
Asian			
% At or Above Proficient	62	50	33
% Advanced	NA	NA	NA
% Below Proficient	38	50	67
Number of students tested	14	16	15
Hispanic			
% At or Above Proficient	52	46	14
% Advanced	9	18	7
% Below Proficient	48	54	86
Number of students tested	23	28	28
Students with Disability			
% At or Above Proficient	23	NA	28
% Advanced	8	NA	7
% Below Proficient	77	NA	71
Number of students tested	13	NA	14
Students with No Reported Disability			
% At or Above Proficient	67	54	47
% Advanced	37	18	19
% Below Proficient	33	46	53
Number of students tested	80	80	75